

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
WWW.USPIG.ED. D.C. 20231
WWW.USPIG.ED.

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/802,631	03/08/2001	David E. Babiarz	04489/91885-501	9953
7590 (44/07/2003				
Steven J. Gol	dstein, Esq.		EXAMI	NER
	VN TODD LLC		MADSEN, ROBERT A	
201 East Fifth			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Cincinnati, OH	1 45202-4182		1761	8
			DATE MAILED: 04/07/2003	ı

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/802,631	BABIARZ ET AL.	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Robert Madsen	1761	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe		correspondence addres	s
THE REPLY FILED 24 March 2003 FAILS TO PLACE T Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	HIS APPLICATION IN CONDIT void abandonment of this applice) a timely filed amendment which all (with appeal fee); or (3) a time	ION FOR ALLOWANC ation. A proper reply to be places the application	E. o a n in
	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WA 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office of the contract of th	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set for later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing SFILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 Clored of extension and the corresponding among the shortened statutory period for reply fice later than three months after the main status of the shortened statutory period for reply fice later than three months after the main status of the shortened status of the	HE FINAL REJECTION. Se FR 1.136(a) and the approprount of the fee. The approp	ee MPEP iate extension riate extension fice action; or
timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37	's Brief must be filed within the p	period set forth in	
37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF	-R 1.191(d)), to avoid distriissar	or the appeal.	
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered I	because:		
(a) ⊠ they raise new issues that would require furth	her consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);		حطد حصنياتات
(c) ⊠ they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or			
(d) they present additional claims without cance	eling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.	
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ction(s):		
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) wou canceling the non-allowable claim(s).			
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request f	·		
 The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. 			
For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendme explanation of how the new or amended claims	ent(s) a) will not be entered or would be rejected is provided be	b)⊠ will be entered arelow or appended.	nd an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follow	s:		
Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u> .			
Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> .			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-3,6-9 and 13</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on	is a) approved or b) disa	approved by the Examir	ner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stater	ment(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)·	
10. Other:			
TO Outer			
1			



Continuation of 2. NOTE: The amendment raises issues under U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for being indefinite with respect to the structural cooperative relationship between the point of attachment and two layers. It is unclear if there is only one point of attachment between two layers, and/or if there is only one point of attachment for the entire coiled structure, assuming there is more than two layers. If the amendment is intended to limit the claim to one single point of attachment between two or more layers, the amendment raises new issues that would require further consideration or search.

STEVE WEINSTEIN

For M. Cano